

**REMARKS**

This reply is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on May 17, 2005 in which claims 33-39 were allowed; in which claims 24-30 were objected to and which claims 1-13, 15-18, 20-23, 31 and 32 were rejected. Based upon the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-13, 15-18, 20-23, 31 and 32 be withdrawn.

I. Examiner Interview Summary.

On July 5, 2005, a telephonic interview was held between Examiner Wallerson and Applicants' attorney, Todd A. Rathe. The rejection of independent claims 1, 11 and 18 based upon Conrad US Patent No. 5,599,120 was discussed. It was tentatively agreed upon that independent claims 1, 11 and 18 are patentably distinct over Conrad since Conrad fails to disclose a media tray having a media edge registration surface (Claim 1), a media holder for a printer having media tray with a media edge registration surface, wherein the holder has an opening allowing media to be placed in contact with the registration surface (Claim 11), a method including positioning in a tray having a media edge registration surface, a media holder containing small media and abutting the small media against the registration surface (Claim 18). Examiner Wallerson agreed to reconsider the previous rejection of such claims in light of the tentative agreement reached during the examiner interview. Applicants wish to thank Examiner Wallerson for the opportunity to discuss the rejections based upon Wallerson.

1. Rejections of Claims 1-13, 15-18, 20, 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based upon Conrad.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-13, 15-18, 20, 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad et al. US Patent No. 5,599,120.

As noted above, during the Examiner interview held on July 5, 2005, as tentatively agreed upon that Claims 1, 11 and 18 are patentably distinct over Conrad

since Conrad fails to disclose a media tray having a media edge registration surface (Claim 1), a media holder for a printer having media tray with a media edge registration surface, wherein the holder has an opening allowing media to be placed in contact with the registration surface (Claim 11), a method including positioning in a tray having a media edge registration surface, a media holder containing small media and abutting the small media against the registration surface (Claim 18).

Moreover, Claims 1 and 11 further recite that the holder has a lateral opening facing the registration surface. Conrad fails to disclose or suggest a holder having a lateral opening. During the interview, the Examiner characterized the opening between guides 54 and 56 as the "lateral opening". However, the front and rear openings between guides 54 and 56 are not lateral openings but are longitudinal openings. One of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand lateral openings to be side openings which face in directions transverse to the direction in which media is generally fed into a printer. The openings between guides 54 and 56 are not lateral openings. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 11 are further patentably distinct over Conrad for this additional reason. Claims 2-9 and 31, Claims 12-17 and 32 and Claim 20 depend from independent Claims 1, 11 and 18 respectively and are patentably distinct over Conrad for the same reasons.

II. Rejections of Claims 10, 21, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based upon Conrad and Parks.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action rejected claims 10, 21, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Conrad et al. US Patent No. 5,599,120 in view of Parks US Patent No. 5,188,353. Claims 10 and 21-23 depend from Claim 1 and overcome the rejections for the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1. In addition, Claims 10 and 21-23 are patentably distinct over Conrad in view of Parks for the following additional reasons.

A. Claim 10

Claim 10 as directed to the Printer of Claim 1 further recites that the holder includes a manually operable clamp for engaging and securing media in the media receptacle.

Neither Conrad nor Parks, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a manually operable clamp. As acknowledged in the Office Action, Conrad fails to disclose a clamp. As a result, the Office Action attempts to additionally rely on Parks and attempt to characterize tamping finger 78 as a “clamping device”. The Office Action’s characterization of tamping finger 78 of Park as a clamping device is erroneous. First, tamping finger 78 is not a clamping a device and does not engage and secure media in a media receptacle. Rather, tamping finger 78 merely tamps “the side edges if sheets against one or the other of side registration walls 81 and 82 so that the sheets can be offset from one another in a direction transverse to the process direction.” (see Column 11, lines 34-38). Second, tamping fingers 78 of Parks are not manually operable. Parks specifically recites that each tamping finger is provided with an oscillating means, an example of which is shown in Figures 10-12 C. (See Column 12, lines 12-24.) Nowhere does Parks appear to disclose that tamping finger 78 are manually operable. Thus, the rejection to Claim 10 based on Parks is improper and should be withdrawn for this additional reason.

B. Claim 21

Claim 21 depends from Claim 1 and recites that the printer further includes a clamp which is movable between a clamped position and an unclamped position and that the clamp is resiliently biased towards the unclamped position.

Neither Conrad nor Parks, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a clamp which is resiliently biased towards an unclamped position. The Office Action attempts to characterize tamping finger 78 of Parks as a “clamping device”. However, the Office Action has failed to even assert that tamping finger 78 is resiliently biased towards an unclamping position. Moreover, nowhere does Parks

disclose that its tamping finger 78 is resiliently biased towards an unclamping position. Thus, the rejection of Claim 21 is improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 22 and 23 dependent from Claim 21 and are patentably distinct over Conrad in view of Parks for the same reason.

C. Claim 23

Claim 23 depends from Claim 21 and recites that the printer includes a manually actuateable button operably coupled to the clamp and configured to actuate the clamp to the clamped position.

Neither Conrad nor Parks, alone or combination have been disclosed or suggest a manually actuateable button operably coupled to the clamp and configured to actuate the clamp to a clamped position. The Office Action attempts to characterize tamping finger 78 of Parks as a “clamping device.” However, the Office Action fails to even assert that Parks includes a manually actuateable button configured to actuate the clamp to a clamped position. Accordingly, the rejection to Claim 23 based upon Conrad in view of Parks is improper and should be withdrawn for this additional reason.

III. Conclusion

After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 1-13, 15-18, 20, 31 and 32 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 11, 2005

By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22879  
Telephone: (414) 297-5710  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,276